

ARTHUR LEE WILLIAMS §
v. § CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:11cv68
PAUL THOMPSON, ET AL. §

The Plaintiff Arthur Lee Williams, proceeding *pro se*, filed this civil rights lawsuit under 42 U.S.C. §1983 complaining of alleged deprivations of his constitutional rights. This Court ordered that the matter be referred to the United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1) and (3) and the Amended Order for the Adoption of Local Rules for the Assignment of Duties to United States Magistrate Judges.

Williams sought a temporary restraining order, but this request was denied. He filed a motion to reconsider this denial, and the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that the motion for reconsideration be denied. No objections have been received to this Report, meaning that the parties are barred from *de novo* review by the district judge of those findings, conclusions, and recommendations and, except upon grounds of plain error, from appellate review of the unobjected-to proposed factual findings and legal conclusions accepted and adopted by the district court. *Douglass v. United Services Automobile Association*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (*en banc*).


The Court has reviewed the pleadings in this cause and the Report of the Magistrate Judge. Upon such review, the Court has determined that the Report of the Magistrate Judge is correct. It is accordingly

ORDERED that the Report of the Magistrate Judge (docket no. 34) is ADOPTED as the opinion of the District Court. It is further

ORDERED that the Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration of the denial of his request for a temporary restraining order (docket no. 33) is hereby DENIED.

It is SO ORDERED.

SIGNED this 19th day of September, 2012.



MICHAEL H. SCHNEIDER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE